



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/684,965	10/10/2000	Yuki Uchida	197849US-28	4230
22850	7590	11/28/2005	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.				DUONG, THOMAS
1940 DUKE STREET				
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314				
				ART UNIT
				PAPER NUMBER
				2145

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/684,965	UCHIDA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thomas Duong	2145

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-51, 54-56, 58-60, 62-64, 66-68, 70-72, and 74-76 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-51, 54-56, 58-60, 62-64, 66-68, 70-72, and 74-76 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is in response to the applicants Amendment filed on September 6, 2005. Applicant amended *claims 1, 13, 25, 37, 42, 47, 54, 58, 62, 66, 70, and 74* and canceled *claims 52-53, 57, 61, 65, 69, and 73*. *Claims 1-51, 54-56, 58-60, 62-64, 66-68, 70-72, and 74-76* are presented for further consideration and examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1-8, 11-20, 23-32, 35-51, 54-56, 58-60, 62-64, 66-68, 70-72, and 74-76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delano (US006430558B1) and in view of Busey et al. (US006377944B1).
4. With regard to claims 1, 13, 25, 37, 42, and 47, Delano discloses,
 - *providing said user with consulting advice regarding said request based upon data input by said user, said consulting advice including advice on document retrieval costs, document storage strategies, document storage organization, protection of secured documents, or delivery options of documents.* (Delano,

col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.4, lines 10-28; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25; col.2, lines 37-62; col.7, line 59 – col.8, line 11)

Delano teaches of a method for searching “*one or more knowledge databases formed by a combination of databases from a global network ... [including] steps of conducting search queries of content of at least one knowledge database, ranking content search results representative of the relative closeness of a requested search query to a search inputted by at least one user*” (Delano, col.3, lines 28-35). According to Delano, “*the collaborative search engine preferably also includes search content browsing means for browsing the content of the search results, search recommending means, e.g., a recommender, ... for recommending at least one of content providing (including content linking), alternative searching and alternative browsing queries to a user*” (Delano, col.5, lines 55-61) and presenting the user with the results. Delano anticipates of providing “*additional information or advertising content in the form of text, images, audio, video, or other media can advantageously be attached to content recommendations and notifications according to recommendation submitters, content providers, or other filter criteria*” (Delano, col.2, lines 49-53). In addition, Delano states “*the topics used to index the content in the Knowledge Base 25 can be organized into a hierarchy that can be browsed by Browser entities 34*” (Delano, col.7, lines 59-61) and that “*at each level, the subtopics can be presented to the user in a weighted ranking similar to the search mechanism, or can be presented in some other optimal ordering, such as most recently added or alphabetically. Subtopics can also be considered to be content items which can be recommended at appropriate topic levels by Recommender critics*” (Delano,

col.7, line 64 – col.8, line 3). Hence, Delano suggests organizing search strategies into topics and subtopics and presenting them to the user when appropriate.

- *selecting an application service provider based on said request;* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)

Delano teaches of a method for searching “*one or more knowledge databases formed by a combination of databases from a global network ... [including] steps of conducting search queries of content of at least one knowledge database, ranking content search results representative of the relative closeness of a requested search query to a search inputted by at least one user*” (Delano, col.3, lines 28-35). Hence, one or more knowledge databases are used to obtain the user requested information.

- *forwarding said request to said application service provider; and* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)

Delano teaches of a method for searching “*one or more knowledge databases formed by a combination of databases from a global network ... [including] steps of conducting search queries of content of at least one knowledge database, ranking content search results representative of the relative closeness of a requested search query to a search inputted by at least one user*” (Delano, col.3, lines 28-35). Hence, one or more knowledge databases are used to obtain the user requested information.

- *receiving information from said application service provider indicating information of a document provided from said application service provider to said user.*

(Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)

Delano teaches that "*the collaborative search engine preferably also includes search content browsing means for browsing the content of the search results, search recommending means, e.g., a recommender, ... for recommending at least one of content providing (including content linking), alternative searching and alternative browsing queries to a user*" (Delano, col.5, lines 55-61) and presenting the user with the results.

However, Delano does not explicitly disclose,

- *receiving a request from a remote user;*

Busey teaches,

- *receiving a request from a remote user;* (Busey, col.4, lines 5-16; col.7, lines 19-45)

Busey teaches of a "*method for providing information in response to a customer request for information ... using a communication network coupled to a database and coupled to a customer input/output device to convey information to and from the customer, the method includes the following steps: receiving signals from the input/output device to indicate a customer query to the database [and] returning information in response to the query*" (Busey, col.4, lines 5-13). According to Busey, "*the web-based nature of the WRU interface to the customer means that the WRU's processes can be executing at one or more remote computers*" (Busey, col.7, lines 35-37).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Busey with the teachings of Delano to further enhance the search engine of Delano by allowing remote

accessibility and distributing processing to the search engine through the use of a web-based user interface.

5. With regard to claims 2, 4, 14, 16, 26, 28, 38, 43, and 48, Delano and Busey disclose,
 - *further comprising the step of providing said user with said document from said application service provider.* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.4, lines 10-28; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)
6. With regard to claims 3, 15, 27, 39, 44, and 49, Delano and Busey disclose,
 - *further comprising the step of providing said application service provider with a user access level.* (Busey, col.6, line 62 – col.7, line 5; col.11, lines 8-20)
7. With regard to claims 5-7, 17-19, and 29-31, Delano and Busey disclose,
 - *wherein the step of providing said documents to said user comprises:*
 - *delivering a print out of said document to said user; and*
 - *providing said user with a URL of said document.* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.4, lines 10-28; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)
8. With regard to claims 8, 20, and 32, Delano and Busey disclose,
 - *further comprising the step of providing said application service provider with a user access level.* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)
9. With regard to claims 11-12, 23-24, and 35-36, Delano and Busey disclose,

- *wherein the receiving information step comprises receiving the information which is the document.* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.4, lines 10-28; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)
- *wherein the receiving information step comprises receiving the information which is a URL for said document.* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.4, lines 10-28; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)

10. With regard to claims 54, 58, 62, 66, 70, and 74, Delano and Busey disclose,

- *wherein the consulting advice provided to said user includes advice on document search strategies, or updating of documents.* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.4, lines 10-28; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)

11. With regard to claims 55-56, 59-60, 63-64, 67-68, 71-72, and 75-76, Delano and Busey disclose,

- *wherein the data input by said user upon which the consulting advice is provided is obtained via a user interaction device by said user in response to a series of questions.* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.4, lines 10-28; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)
- *wherein the data input by said user upon which the consulting advice is provided is generated based upon previously acquired data from said user.* (Delano; col.2, line 63 – col.3, line 39; col.4, lines 10-28; col.5, line 55 – col.6, line 25)

12. Claims 9-10, 21-22 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Delano (US006430558B1), in view of Busey et al. (US006377944B1), and further in view of Kenner (US006112239A).
13. With regard to claims 9-10, 21-22 and 33-34, Delano and Busey disclose,
 - See *claims 1, 13 and 25* rejection as detailed above.
However, Delano and Busey do not explicitly disclose,
 - *further comprising the steps of:*
 - *generating a unified bill from bills received from application service providers; and transmitting said unified bill to said user.*
 - *wherein the receiving information step comprises receiving the information which is a billing information.*
 - Kenner teaches,
 - *further comprising the steps of:*
 - *generating a unified bill from bills received from application service providers; and transmitting said unified bill to said user.* (Kenner, col.21, lines 16-28)
Kenner teaches of the use of a database to track the charges incurred by a user. According to Kenner, "*each user can have an associated 'account' to track charges, [and] the user can be charged for use of the Smart Mirror system by the file, by the megabyte, by the month, or by other means*" (Kenner, col.21, lines 20-23).
 - *wherein the receiving information step comprises receiving the information which is a billing information.* (Kenner, col.21, lines 16-28)

Kenner teaches of the use of a database to track the charges incurred by a user.

According to Kenner, “*each user can have an associated ‘account’ to track charges, [and] the user can be charged for use of the Smart Mirror system by the file, by the megabyte, by the month, or by other means*” (Kenner, col.21, lines 20-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine the teachings of Kenner with the teachings of Delano and Busey to further enhance the delivering controlled of formatted document for accounting purposes over a communications network, such as the internet, wherein information contained in the document is arranged into a pre-determined layout or file format upon request by the client.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments with respect to *claims 1, 13, 25, 37, 42, and 47* have been considered but they are deemed not persuasive.

15. With regard to *claims 1, 13, 25, 37, 42, and 47*, the Applicants argue that,
 - *The Delano reference does not disclose or even suggest consulting advice that includes advice on document retrieval costs, document storage strategies, document storage organization, protection of secured documents, or delivery options of documents, as recited in the independent claims of the present application.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments are not persuasive because Delano anticipates of providing “*additional information or advertising*

content in the form of text, images, audio, video, or other media can advantageously be attached to content recommendations and notifications according to recommendation submitters, content providers, or other filter criteria" (Delano, col.2, lines 49-53). In addition, Delano states "*the topics used to index the content in the Knowledge Base 25 can be organized into a hierarchy that can be browsed by Browser entities 34*" (Delano, col.7, lines 59-61) and that "*at each level, the subtopics can be presented to the user in a weighted ranking similar to the search mechanism, or can be presented in some other optimal ordering, such as most recently added or alphabetically. Subtopics can also be considered to be content items which can be recommended at appropriate topic levels by Recommender critics*" (Delano, col.7, line 64 – col.8, line 3). Hence, Delano suggests organizing search strategies into topics and subtopics and presenting them to the user when appropriate. In addition, Delano also suggests making available information regarding the requested data in multiple formats.

- *However, the Busey et al. reference fails to supplement the above deficiency in the teachings of the Delano reference. More specifically, the Busey et al. reference does not disclose or even suggest consulting advice that includes advice on document retrieval costs, document storage strategies, document storage organization, protection of secured documents, or delivery options of documents, as recited in the independent claims of the present application.*

However, the Examiner finds that the Applicants' arguments mute since Delano already discloses this limitation as presented above.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas Duong whose telephone number is 571/272-3911. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30AM - 4:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason D. Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 571/273-8300 for regular communications and 571/273-8300 for After Final communications.

Thomas Duong (AU2145)

November 22, 2005



Jason C. Cardone

Supervisory PE (AU2145)